Message sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Figural Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments FCC Information Message text follows:

Narcy Campbell 307 Red Eill Road Gordonsville, VA 22942-6335

September 22, 2003

[resignent address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

RECEIVED & THE CONT.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all' charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Manny Campbell

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
F.doral Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

elizabeth sharp 100 (onselyea propkly), NY 11211-2302

Santomber 22, 2003

[rclipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

SECENCIA MENTERS COM

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers object changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month requiriless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to scrools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and 1 do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits a 1" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Pullabeth sharp

Message sent to the following recipients:
Foderal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
F. John Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 95-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Intermation
Message text follows:

Wairen Winter 34<sup>4</sup>8 Indian Lane Doraville, GA 30340-2708

Sou ember 22, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

RECEIVED & INSPECTION . COM

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month rejardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Warien Winter

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Missige text follows:

Beverly Smith Bank Examiner 412 Goucher Blvd Baltimore, MD 21286-2965

September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

PHOENE IN THE PARTY OF THE PART

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the ECC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The MSF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket in some tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a car of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits  $\mathbf{a}^{\dagger}$ :" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Bevorly A. Smith Bank Examiner

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Filteral Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

erro lewis a count executive 1903 cherri drive ta church, VA 22043-1071

September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and N3D File No. L-00-72.

SHEETHER SHEETH OF THE SORM

i am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FOC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

3. erely,

of newis account executive

Message sent to the following recipients. Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 46-45 FCC Official Comments FCC Information Message text follows.

C. Johnson Office Manager 07812266900 11223 Joyceton Dr. Opper Mariboro, MD 20774-1541

September 23, 2003

Tredipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

C3 Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NS3 File No. L-00-72.

RECEIVED & INSPECTED |
RECEIVED & INSPECTED |
FCC - MAIL ROOM

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nordiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket insome tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

C. Jornson
Off ce Manager
1~12066900

1

Massage sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket #6-45 FCC Official Comments
FTO Internation
Massage text follows:

Edward Fine 319 South Pl. Louisville, CO 80027-1648

September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear (recipient name was inserted here),

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

REFERENCE TO MAN TO THE PARTY OF THE PARTY O

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits uni" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Edward Hine

Message sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Dock-t 96-45 ECC Official Comments ECC Information Message text follows:

John E. Hoy III Mill Ar 9764 Manteo Court Horr Washington, MD 20744-6919

Saptomber 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC booket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge and FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I po not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack or gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits " charge for wireless phones?

1

dimmerely,

John F. Hoy III Mister

RECEIVED TO THE PARTY.

Message sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments FCC Information
Message text follows:

mitch arnowitz 1729 glastonberry rd rockvlle, MD 20854-2642

september 23, 2003

[rdd:pient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Jocket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

THEOR WALLE JOHN

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USE was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" tharge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Tit h achowitz

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Doiket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

William Duffy 2269 Havenridge Drive Colorado Springs, CO 80920-6201

Sep+ember 23, 2003

[rempient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

MCC. M. C. Marin

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the ECC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month rejardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nordiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Walliam Duffy

Message sent to the following recipients:
Eederal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Fcdaral Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

Jeyde Schneider 14 Valley Rd Locust Valley, NY 11560-2603

September 23, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

RECEIVED TO THE PARTY OF THE PA

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits ali" sharge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Joyce Schneider

Message sent to the following recipients. Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin rederal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments acc Information
Message text follows:

Michael Marshall 21%-05090635 500 a. 8th 0t. Cozad, NE 69130-1900

September 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Deur [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and Not File No. L-00-72.


I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a park of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits sai" charge for wireless phones?

Jim ∈reiy,

Michael D Marshall 218-05090635



Message sent to the following recipients
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Foderal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments
Fig Information
Message Lext follows:

Philip bender 919 18th Street, NW Washington, DC 20006-5503

Sarlember 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC booket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

FCC-MAILEDOM

I am approsed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I  $\infty$  not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits act;" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Philip Bender

Message sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Enderal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket Me-45 FCC Official Comments

ECC In Objection
Message text follows:

Starer May 993) S Hark Cir Fairfax Station, VA 22039-2910

September 24, 2003

[r-diplent address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC looket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and N3D File No. L-00-72.

FOC MAILFORM

I in opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I no not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month tegardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long discance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits ail" charge for wireless phones?

Sin erely,

Steren Day

Message sent to tre following recipients. Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 96-45 FCC Official Comments ECU information
Message text follows:

Jane Wise Manager, Telco Svos 634) LBU Erreway Dallas, TX 75240-6405

September 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSP File No. L-00-72

FCC MAIL FOOM

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pabliof gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits and "thange for wireless phones?"

Sincerely,

Jane M. Wise Manager, Telco Svcs Message sent to the following recipients:

Redual Communications Commission Chair Powell

Redual Communications Commissioner Martin

Federal Communications Commissioner Copps

3. deral Communications Commissioner Abernathy

Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein

Dooket 96-45 FCC Official Comments

FCC Information

Message text follows:

Janes West in 51. 36438 Smith Road Romulus, MI 48174-4106

September 24, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSI File No. L-00-72

RECEIVED & INSPECTED |

1 am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a park of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" Tharge for wireless phones?

s, receiv.

james west CSA Message sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Regeral Communications Commissioner Martin Februal Communications Commissioner Copps Ecderal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Docket 96-4" FCC Official Comments FCC Information Message text follows:

Sean Murphy 131 Kalorama Rd NW Washington, DC 20009-5152

September 24, 2003

[resignent address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSJ File No. L-00-72

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

NOV U 6 2003 FCC-MAILROOM

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sim erely,

Sear Murchy

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Cocket '6-45 FC' Official Comments
EC' Information
Message fext follows:

Thorase Vaughn 9213 Long Branch Pkwy Silver Spring, MD 20901-3642

September 26, 2003

[red pient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the ECC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and J do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Th⊢rese S. Vaughn



Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-47 FCC Official Comments
FOR Information
Mersage text follows:

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

NUV 0 8 2005

FCC - MAILROOM

Susan Schmitt 11816 Eton Manor Drive #301 Ceimantown, MD 20876-3955

September 26, 2003

frecipient address was inserted here}

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits at!" tharge for wireless phones?

Sincerely,

Susur Schmitt

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Tookel 96-45 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

NOV 0 to 2003
FCC - MAILFOOM

k.il carperter
2451 pioneer point id.
gatera, MO 65656-4956

September 26, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSC File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the ECC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was apparted to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and to not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits at." Tharge for wireless phones?

or erely.

bill carpenter

Message sent to the following recipients: Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell Federal Communications Commissioner Martin Federal Communications Commissioner Copps Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein Do ket 36-45 FCC Official Comments ECC Information.

Message text follows:

Earl Hoisington
'''' Arrington Ct
Malassas, VA 20112-4529

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

HILL U # 2003

FCC - MAILROOM

September 26, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

C1 Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No 1-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the apility for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to sensels, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I is not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits ali" charge for wireless phones?

Si Pereiv,

Lar doisington

Message sent to the following recipients:
Federal Communications Commission Chair Powell
Federal Communications Commissioner Martin
Federal Communications Commissioner Copps
Federal Communications Commissioner Abernathy
Federal Communications Commissioner Adelstein
Docket 96-15 FCC Official Comments
FCC Information
Message text follows:

RECEIVED & INSPECTED |
NOV 0 & 200
FCC - MAILROOM

Bornard Virtue Tax Payer 3.31 Courtney Ave Kingman, AZ 86401-6460

September 26, 2003

[respect address was inserted here]

Dear [recipient name was inserted here],

CC Douket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month rejardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize wireless phone customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?

Juncerely,

Bernard Virtue Tax Plyer